Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	, 09/936,487	BARTHEL, DOMINIQUE
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Dipakkumar Gandhi	2133
All Participants:	Status of Application	·
(1) <u>Dipakkumar Gandhi</u> .	(3)	
(2) Eric S. Hyman.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 22 November 2004	Time: <u>3 PM (EST)</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	pplicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: Claim 3, 14, 25		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE G See Continuation Sheet	ENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sur 	n. The examiner will provide a rate record of the substance o	written summary of the substance f the interview, since the interview
DB) and .		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (App	licant/Applicant's Representativ	ve Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner suggested the following changes to the amendment submitted on 9/27/2004. The applicant's attorney Eric S. Hyman agreed for the following changes:

- -In the amended claim 3, line 2, (ISO) should be deleted.
- -In the amended claim 14,
 - Line 2, input channel (Si), clock channel (CM) is incorrect. It should be -input channel (SI), clock channel (CK).
 - Line 4-5, input channel (ST), clock channel (CM) is incorrect. It should be -input channel (SI), clock channel (CK).
- In the new claim 25, line 1, Tester according to claims 22 to 24 is incorrect. It should be -- Tester according to any one of claims 22 to 24--..